



## *Internal Reviews*

### *Performance Period January 2005-March 2005*

## Introduction

Twenty-one complexes conducted their Internal Reviews in the third quarter of fiscal year 2005 (January 2005-March 2005). This marked their third year of implementing internally managed processes for examination of performance of local service systems in providing services and supports for students with special needs. This report provides data regarding the results of the reviews conducted during the quarter.

## Findings

In the quarter, eighteen of the 21 complexes (85%) conducting Internal Reviews in the quarter achieved the desired goal for acceptable system performance. Overall child status was acceptable for 93% of youth reviewed. Three complexes (Ka'u, Baldwin, and Hana) did not meet the performance target of 85% or better acceptable system performance. System performance for both Ka'u and Baldwin Complexes was acceptable for 79% of the youth reviewed and for only 62% of the Hana students reviewed. The complexes all met the performance target for child status (Ka'u-100%, Baldwin-93%, and Hana-85%). Additional analysis of performance patterns and trends are found on page 8 of this report.

All but one of the twenty-one complexes reviewed met the performance goal for child status. The only complex not meeting acceptable child status was West Kauai where 79% of those reviewed were found to be doing acceptably well across measures of child well-being. Among the children reviewed who were receiving services from Early Intervention in the West Kauai Complex, 50% were doing well in child status and system performance.

Below are the Statewide results for all Internal Reviews conducted in the third quarter (January 2005-March 2005):

<b>STATE TOTAL</b> <b>n=344</b>			
<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>88% (n=303)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>5% (n=16)</b>	<b>93%</b> <b>(n=319)</b>	
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>5% (n=17)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>2% (n=8)</b>	<b>93%</b> <b>(n=320)</b>	

Table 1. Statewide Internal Review Results (Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2005)

To date, all 41 complexes have been reviewed. One complex, Kealakehe, was reviewed in the fourth quarter, and those results will be fully discussed in next quarter's report. In this school year, 37 of the 41 complexes (90%) have met the performance goal of 85% or better system performance.

Child Status and System Performance results for each complex reviewed in the third quarter (January 2005-March 2005) Internal Reviews are displayed below in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Internal Reviews for Child Status and System Performance (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

Complex	Date	Sample Size	Child Status SY 2004-2005	System Performance SY 2004-2005
Kea'au	January 18-21, 2005	14	93%	93%
Molokai	January 18-21, 2005	12	100%	100%
Castle	January 24-28, 2005	22	95%	95%
Kaimuki	January 24-28, 2005	18	100%	100%
Kapolei	January 24-28, 2005	15	87%	93%
Ka'u	January 31, February 1-4, 2005	14	100%	79%
Lahainaluna	January 31, February 1-4, 2005	14	86%	86%
Mililani	January 31, February 1-4, 2005	22	86%	95%
Roosevelt	February 7-11, 2005	18	94%	100%
Waipahu	February 7-11, 2005	21	86%	95%
Moanalua	February 8-11, 2005	14	100%	100%
Baldwin	February 14-18, 2005	14	93%	79%
Honoka'a	February 14-18, 2005	13	85%	100%
Leilehua	February 14-18, 2005	22	95%	95%
Waimea (West Kauai)	February 22-25, 2005	14	79%	93%
Hana	February 28, March 1-4, 2005	13	85%	62%
Waiakea	February 28, March 1-4, 2005	14	100%	100%
Waianae	February 28, March 1-4, 2005	22	95%	91%
McKinley	March 7-11, 2005	14	100%	93%
Kailua	March 14-18, 2005	15	100%	93%
Maui High	March 14-18, 2005	19	95%	95%

## Description of the Samples

There were a total of 344 students reviewed in the quarter. Table 3 shows the distribution of cases reviewed across school levels and Early Intervention.

Table 3. Distribution of the Sample (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

	High School	Middle School	Elementary School	Early Intervention	3rd Quarter
Kea'au	5	3	4	2	<b>14</b>
Molokai	5	2	5	0	<b>12</b>
Castle	6	4	10	2	<b>22</b>
Kaimuki	4	5	7	2	<b>18</b>
Kapolei	5	4	5	1	<b>15</b>
Ka'u	3	4	5	2	<b>14</b>
Lahainaluna	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Mililani	6	5	9	2	<b>22</b>
Roosevelt	4	5	7	2	<b>18</b>
Waipahu	6	4	9	2	<b>21</b>
Moanalua	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Baldwin	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Honoka'a	3	3	6	1	<b>13</b>
Leilehua	5	5	10	2	<b>22</b>
Waimea (West Kauai)	4	3	5	2	<b>14</b>
Hana	5	4	3	1	<b>13</b>
Waiakea	4	4	4	2	<b>14</b>
Waianae	8	4	8	2	<b>22</b>
McKinley	4	2	6	2	<b>14</b>
Kailua	6	3	5	1	<b>15</b>
Maui High	5	5	7	2	<b>19</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>344</b>

Further description of the sample is presented in Table 4. Sampling guidelines call for samples to be based on 2% of the IDEA population and 1% of the 504-student population. Of the total number of cases reviewed in the third quarter (N=344), 19% were receiving care coordination from the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD). Overall, approximately 49% were IDEA or 504 Felix class students that are receiving case management services by the schools, 21% are IDEA non-Felix students, and 10% were receiving Early Intervention Services. This distribution meets the requirements for sampling distribution set by the State for all complexes with the exception of Molokai, where no children receiving Early Intervention services were included in the sample.

Table 4. Description of the Sample (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

	CAMHD Felix	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA Non-Felix	Early Intervention	3rd Quarter
Kea'au	3	6	3	2	<b>14</b>
Molokai	1	8	3	0	<b>12</b>
Castle	4	11	5	2	<b>22</b>
Kaimuki	2	10	4	2	<b>18</b>
Kapolei	3	8	3	1	<b>15</b>
Ka'u	3	6	3	2	<b>14</b>
Lahainaluna	3	7	2	2	<b>14</b>
Mililani	4	12	4	2	<b>22</b>
Roosevelt	3	9	4	2	<b>18</b>
Waipahu	5	10	4	2	<b>21</b>
Moanalua	3	6	3	2	<b>14</b>
Baldwin	3	6	3	2	<b>14</b>
Honoka'a	3	6	3	1	<b>13</b>
Leilehua	5	10	5	2	<b>22</b>
Waimea (West Kauai)	2	7	3	2	<b>14</b>
Hana	4	5	3	1	<b>13</b>
Waiakea	4	5	3	2	<b>14</b>
Waianae	4	11	5	2	<b>22</b>
McKinley	1	8	3	2	<b>14</b>
Kailua	3	9	2	1	<b>15</b>
Maui High	4	9	4	2	<b>19</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>344</b>

Table 5 displays the range of IDEA disability categories that were represented in the samples. The 344 youth reviewed represented the 14 IDEA eligibility categories, 504 Felix students, and children who are categorized as Early Intervention IDEA. The largest percentage of youth was in the category of Emotional Disturbance (19%). Specific Learning Disability (14%) and Other Health Impairments (13%) were the next most frequent.

Table 5. Disability Categories (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

	Kea'au	Molokai	Castle	Kaimuki	Kapolei	Ka'u	Lahainaluna	Mililani	Roosevelt	Waipahu	Moanalua	Baldwin	Honoka'a	Leilehua	Waimea (West Kauai)	Hana	Waiakea	Waianae	McKinley	Kailua	Maui High	Total
Autism	1		2	2	2		1	2	2	1	1	1		1	1		1		2	1	1	22
Deaf/Blindness																						0
Deafness	1	1																				2
Developmental Delay	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2		1	1	1	2		1	23
Emotional Disturbance	3	2	5	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	2	1	3	4	1	6	2	6	1	2	3	64
Hearing Impairment		1	1	1	1					1		1			1	1		1		2	1	12
Mental Retardation	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	2	27
Multiple Disabilities		1	1	1				1	1					1	1		1	1	1	1	1	12
Orthopedic Impairment				1				1		2	1			1				1			2	9
Other Health Impairments	2	3	4	1	2	2	3	4	3	1	1	4	2	3	3	1	1	2		1	2	45
Specific Learning Disability	2	1	1	1	1	5	1	3	4	3	3	1	2	4	1	2	3	3	3	3	2	49
Speech/Language Impairment			1	1				1		1		1		1							1	7
Traumatic Brain Injury			1	1	1				1	1	1	1			1		1	1	1			11
Visual Impairment					1		1	1		1				1								5
504 Felix	1	1	1	1	1		1	2	1	1	1		1	1	2		1	1	1	1	1	20
IDEA, Early Intervention	2		2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	36
<b>3rd Quarter</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>344</b>

## Participants

A total of 701 school, Family Guidance Center (FGC) and University of Hawaii (UH) personnel, and community members, including parents, participated in the Internal Reviews conducted in the reporting quarter. The participants represented 30 different role groups. The largest group represented was Special Education Teachers (191), followed by School Counselors (76), Resource Teachers (73) and Early Intervention Personnel (71) and Student Services Coordinators (43). There was some duplication in counts for State-level DOE staff, CAMHD Performance Management staff, and Quality Assurance Specialists, who participate in multiple complex reviews.

Table 6. Internal Review Participants (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

	Kea'au	Molokai	Castle	Kaimuki	Kapolei	Ka'u	Lahainaluna	Milliani	Roosevelt	Waipahu	Moanalua	Baldwin	Honoka'a	Leilehua	Waimea (West Kauai)	Hana	Waiakea	Waianae	McKinley	Kailua	Maui High	Total
Counselor (School, Special Education, High Risk, Academic, 504, Department Chair)	4	3	4	4	8	1		10	4	8	2	6	1	6		2		9		2	2	76
Educational Assistant														1								1
Principal			3	6				1	1	1				1		1				4	1	19
Vice Principal			1	3	2		2	3	2	2					2	2	1	3			3	26
Psychological Examiner								1			1			1								3
DOE Contracted Mentors	4		3	1	1	3		2	1	3	2		2	2	2		2	3	1	1	2	35
DOE Contracted: Others					2							1							1			4
Resource Teacher (State, District, Complex, PSAP, Student Support, Literacy, CSSS)		5	2	5		1	3	4	5	2		8	6	2	7	3	3	3	3	5	6	73
SBBH Therapist, Manager		1	4			3		3				1		1		2	1			3	1	20
Psychologist (District, Complex, School)	2								1								1		1			5
Special Education Department Chair	2	1			1																	4
Special Education Teacher (including Pre-School Teacher)	6	1	13	10	10	8	5	12	13	15	11	8	3	26		4	3	14	11	11	7	191
Speech Language Pathologist		1						1														2
Student Services Coordinator	2	3	4	1	4	1	4		1	5	2	1	2	2			4		2	1	4	43
Teacher (General Ed, Title I, Reading, Transition, GT)	2		3	2		3		2	3	2	7							10	6			40
Coordinator (Evaluation, School Health, SID, Curriculum, Literacy, Rise)					1																	1
School Assessment Liaison, SAC																						0
Librarian, Reading Specialist				1												1						2
Autism Consultant																						0
Special Education Director, Educational Specialist, School Renewal Specialist, District Educational Specialist, Retired Administrator, DOE Administrator	1		3		1	1		1	2	1		1	1	1			3				2	18
Social Worker				2				2												2	4	10
Parent/Community Member, UH Faculty Member	1		3						1			1	4					2	1		1	14
Branch Chief, Clinical Director, Mokihana Director								1	1	1					1				1			5
CAMHD Program Manager, Supervisor																						0
Quality Assurance Specialist, DOH		1	2					1		1	2			1	1				1	1	1	12
Family Support Worker, FGC															2							2
Mental Health Care Coordinator, Mentor	3				1	2		1	2	1	1		2	1			3	1	1	3		22
Mental Health Supervisor															2							2
Public Health Nurse																						0
Early Intervention Personnel	3		4	4	1	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	2	4	5	2	3	6	6	1	4	71
<b>3rd Quarter Total Participants</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>701</b>

## Review Outcomes and Trends

### *Statewide Child Status and System Performance Findings*

As previously discussed, 85% of the complexes reviewed in the quarter performed acceptably well in performance of their local service systems. The complexes generally did well across measures of acceptable understanding of students' situation, and planning/implementing services. Where indicators in specific complexes showed a need for improvement, adequate strategies to address these areas were found in most Complex Improvement Plans.

Of note is that system performance for children receiving services through the Early Intervention system continues to be a concern in a number of complexes statewide. Of the 38 children reviewed in the third quarter, system performance was acceptable for only 62%. The trend regarding unacceptable system performance for a growing percentage of young children has been noted over the last several years and is a growing concern for the state. It should also be noted that as described in the Description of the Sample section of this report, no children receiving Early Intervention services were included in the Molokai sample. The inclusion of the supervisor of the Early Intervention Section (Department of Health) in the Statewide Quality Assurance Committee is a key strategy to begin to address this trend.

Overall Child Status was a concern in only one of the twenty-one complexes (West Kauai [79%]). Data for this complex indicates that child status indicators for Responsible Behavior and Safety were a concern for 21% of the youth. Strategies for impacting child status in this community are warranted.

Of particular note is stability was a child-status concern in 10 of the 21 (57%) complexes reviewed in the third quarter. Stability data needs some further analysis in order to understand the nature of the situation, the lack of acceptable performance in this indicator may mean that more youth are not receiving services in school or out-of-home settings that are free from risk of disruption. Stability and consistency of setting is an important factor in youth achieving a sense of identity, security, attachments and optimal social development.

### *Baldwin, Hana and Ka'u Performance Findings*

As discussed previously, of the twenty-one complexes reviewed, all but three complexes (Baldwin Complex, Hana and Ka'u Complex, , and Complex) performed at an acceptable level for system performance. Ka'u and Baldwin were 6% below the performance threshold and Hana was 23% below the performance threshold.

Table 7. System Performance Results by Agency Involvement (Third Quarter, FY 2005)

Complex		Early Intervention	FGC Care Coordinated	IDEA / 504 SBBH	IDEA
Ka'u	Acceptable	1	2	5	3
	Unacceptable	1	1	1	0
Baldwin	Acceptable	1	2	5	3
	Unacceptable	1	1	1	0
Hana	Acceptable	0	2	3	3
	Unacceptable	1	2	2	0



### **Baldwin Complex**

Similarly, system performance for students reviewed in the Baldwin complex was acceptable for 79%, although there was a wider range of indicators that were found to be unacceptable. Indicators of concern and the corresponding percentage of acceptable performance were:

- 1) functional assessments (79%),
- 2) addressing students' focal concerns (79%),
- 3) having a long-term guiding view (64%),
- 4) unity of effort across agencies (79%),
- 5) individualized plans and service fit (79%),
- 6) contingency plans for safety and health (67%),
- 7) overall planning services (79%),
- 8) availability of resources for implementation (79%),
- 9) adequacy of service intensity (79%),
- 10) overall implementation of services (70%),
- 11) risk reduction (79%), and
- 12) successful transitions (79%).

Again, similar to Ka'u, Baldwin complex would benefit from stronger team practices for systematically tracking the quality of plans and their implementation across the dimensions cited above. These functions should occur minimally at the supervisory and peer review levels. Because there were serious child status concerns for at least one of the students in the sample, and unacceptable system performance for 21%, strengthened training and assurances for monitoring of the key service system functions for each student is needed.

### **Hana Complex**

Of particular concern among the complexes reviewed in the third quarter was system performance for the Hana complex. With the exception of just a few indicators of system performance, virtually all areas performed below the targeted performance. Scoring on the indicators of concern ranged between 54% and 77% acceptability. Overall system performance was 62%. The following indicators were below acceptable performance for the Hana complex:

- 1) functioning service teams (77%),
- 2) identifying students' focal concerns (69%),
- 3) functional assessments (69%),
- 4) overall understanding of students' situation (69%),
- 5) addressing students' focal concerns (69%),
- 6) having a long-term guiding view (62%),
- 7) unity of effort across agencies (54%),
- 8) individualized plans and service fit (77%),
- 9) contingency plans for safety and health (80%),
- 10) overall planning services (69%),
- 11) availability of resources for implementation (69%),
- 12) timely implementation of plans (62%),
- 13) adequacy of service intensity (62%),
- 14) coordination of services (62%),

- 15) caregiver supports (54%)
- 16) overall implementation of services (62%),
- 17) changing the focal situation (77%)
- 18) impacting academic situations (77%)
- 19) risk reduction (79%), and
- 20) problem solving (62%),

Areas of concern for child status were responsible behavior of students (77%), stability (62%), and students receiving services in their home communities (77%). The results included two students receiving school-based services who had unacceptable child status, which may indicate a need for more intensive services than they were receiving. The level of performance of the Hana complex points toward an immediate need for focused technical assistance geared to improving the skills and practices of staff across multiple areas of service delivery. System performance was unacceptable for youth across levels of services including school-based behavioral health, Family Guidance Center, and Early Intervention services. State-level leadership of the Departments should carefully examine the data and results for the Hana complex in order to discern the most appropriate interventions and types of assistance.

### **Ka'u Complex**

For the Ka'u complex, system performance was acceptable for 79% of students reviewed. Areas of concern regarding system performance included:

- 1) child and family participation,
- 2) the functioning of service teams,
- 3) unity of effort across agencies,
- 4) individualized plans and service fit,
- 5) adequacy of service intensity,
- 6) overall service implementation,
- 7) risk reduction, and
- 8) successful transitions.

Each of these indicators was acceptable for 79% of students reviewed. Child status was acceptable for 100% of those reviewed. Specific child status indicators of concern were stability (acceptable for 71%), and youth served in their home community or least restrictive environment (acceptable for 79%). The Ka'u complex would likely benefit from training and oversight for practice improvements in the areas of family engagement, formulating plans that are adequately designed, and implementing services at the right intensity that reduce risks for youth. Systematic review of each child's plan through peer review and school-based mechanisms would help Ka'u to achieve stronger system performance for students.

### ***Adequacy of Internal Review Reports***

Each Internal Review generates a report on the results of the reviews, reporting on core performance indicators, and an improvement plan on areas identified as needing strengthening based on review findings and data. The overall goal is to imbed reflective practice at all levels that will facilitate improvements that are based on accurate, current data. To assure an accurate read and proactive improvement strategies, the reports are reviewed and feedback is provided. Each report is due thirty days following the

conclusion of the Internal Review unless a specific waiver is granted, and feedback is due back to the complex within another thirty days.

Responses to the reports received in the third quarter are in process. Feedback is given in two main areas: the quality of the report and the review process, and the quality of the improvement plan. The plan itself can be accepted, accepted with refinements recommended, or commented on with a request for a revised plan. Content analyses of Internal Review Reports reveal positive statewide trends and patterns demonstrating viable local service systems in most areas of the state. Concerns identified by review teams are generally adequately addressed in Complex Action Plans.

## Summary

Based on the scores from the Internal Reviews conducted in the third quarter, the state continues to demonstrate that the majority of youth with special needs continue to do well, and consistently receive services that are well coordinated, well implemented, and are producing positive results. System performance has been acceptable for 94% of the 640 students that have been reviewed this school year through the third quarter. A full 96% were found to have acceptable child status. Although several complexes will need focused technical assistance to assure each service team is functioning well, the majority of complexes continue to maintain performance at acceptable levels. Recommendations for improvement for complexes performing below expectations will be discussed at the next Statewide QA Committee Meeting, along with strategies for ongoing monitoring of implementation of improvement activities.

Overall, the state has built internal review practices that systematically discern needs, and a statewide accountability system that can track the implementation of changes. The expanded membership of the Statewide Quality Assurance Committee, and growing interagency engagement at the local-level QA Committees is another advent in the development of stronger partnerships across Hawaii's System of Care. The continued positive results of the complexes to date demonstrate not only a viable service system, but one that performs consistently well for the vast majority of students.

## Complex Data

The following section provides a “profile” of each complex reviewed over the third quarter of fiscal year 2005 (January 2005-March 2005). Presented are data by complex on Internal Reviews and core indicators for the Family Guidance Centers and schools. Data are current for the quarter the Internal Review occurred. Family Guidance Center data include number and percentage of clients: 1) in out of state treatment settings, 2) in out of home treatment, 3) with service delivery gaps, 4) with complaints, and 5) who have current CSPs. Also included are data on the 6) sample size of CSPs that were audited with a CSP quality instrument, and 7) the percentage of those with overall acceptable quality. 8) Staffing vacancies in the FGC for the complex are also presented. School data for each complex include 1) number of service gaps, 2) percentage of referrals that were processed within timelines, 3) number of written and telephone complaints received by the State Office, 4) number of hearing requests, and 5) percentage of special education teachers that are certified. Also presented are data on 6) suspensions (regular education to special education numbers and ratios).

## Kea'au January 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**93%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	67	0%
Out of Home	17	67	25%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	67	0%
Complaints	0	67	0%
CSP Timelines	57	67	85%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	3	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	0	0	0	91.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,170	400	413	50	18.43	12.07

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Molokai January 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=12

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=12)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	7	0%
Out of Home	2	7	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	7	0%
Complaints	2	7	29%
CSP Timelines	7	7	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	74%	0	0	1	89.50%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	820	44	182	22	5.37	12.09

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Castle January 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=22

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>95% (n=21)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>95% (n=21)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	

95%  
(n=21)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	1	37	3%
Out of Home	7	37	19%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	37	0%
Complaints	0	37	0%
CSP Timelines	29	35	83%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	97%	3	0	2	92.9%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	5,042	283	786	33	5.6	4.2

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kaimuki January 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>100% (n=18)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=18)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=18)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	12	0%
Out of Home	2	12	17%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	12	0%
Complaints	0	12	0%
CSP Timelines	12	12	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	3	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	71%	1	0	4	100%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	4,941	506	546	20	10.2	3.7

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## Kapolei January 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=15

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>87% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>93% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	

87%  
(n=13)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	28	0%
Out of Home	14	28	50%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	28	4%
Complaints	0	28	0%
CSP Timelines	17	28	61%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	2	67%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
5	97%	4	0	1	93.9%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	5,992	317	639	40	5.3	6.3

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Ka'u January-February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>79% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>79% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>21% (n=3)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	16	0%
Out of Home	5	16	31%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	16	0%
Complaints	0	16	0%
CSP Timelines	16	16	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	87%	0	0	0	100%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	700	58	142	0	8.3	0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Lahainaluna January-February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>72% (n=10)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>86% (n=12)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**86%  
(n=12)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	15	0%
Out of Home	3	15	20%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	15	0%
Complaints	0	15	0%
CSP Timelines	15	15	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	97%	0	0	0	93.8%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,672	178	362	25	6.7	6.9

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Mililani January-February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=22

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=19)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>9% (n=2)</b>	<b>95% (n=21)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	

**86%  
(n=19)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	14	0%
Out of Home	2	14	14%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	14	0%
Complaints	0	14	0%
CSP Timelines	14	14	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	99%	0	0	2	97.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	6,971	207	795	7	2.97	.88

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Roosevelt February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=18

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>97% (n=17)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>6% (n=1)</b>	<b>100% (n=18)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**94%  
(n=17)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	16	0%
Out of Home	4	16	25%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	16	0%
Complaints	0	16	0%
CSP Timelines	16	16	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	3	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	100%	3	0	2	92.2%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	6,081	276	555	11	4.5	2.0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waipahu February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=21

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>81% (n=17)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>14% (n=3)</b>	<b>95% (n=20)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**86%  
(n=18)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	27	0%
Out of Home	8	27	30%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	27	0%
Complaints	0	27	0%
CSP Timelines	13	27	48%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	84%	2	0	3	82.7%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	7,841	634	787	11	8.1	1.4

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Moanalua February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>100% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

100%  
(n=14)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	21	0%
Out of Home	6	21	29%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	21	0%
Complaints	0	21	0%
CSP Timelines	21	21	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	100%	2	0	0	91.3%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	4,531	169	431	8	3.7	1.8

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Baldwin February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>79% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>79% (n=11)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>7% (n=1)</b>	

**93%  
(n=13)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	15	0%
Out of Home	3	15	20%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	15	0%
Complaints	0	15	0%
CSP Timelines	15	15	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	1	50%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
2	79%	0	0	1	87%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,858	172	446	32	4.4	7.2

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## Honoka'a February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>85% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>	<b>100% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**85%  
(n=11)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	33	0%
Out of Home	8	33	24%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	33	0%
Complaints	0	33	0%
CSP Timelines	29	33	88%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	0	0%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	94%	0	0	1	96%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,244	197	311	4	8.8	1.3

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Leilehua February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=22

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>90% (n=20)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>95% (n=21)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**95%  
(n=21)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	42	0%
Out of Home	4	42	10%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	42	0%
Complaints	0	42	0%
CSP Timelines	42	42	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	94%	1	0	1	95.7%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	6,199	325	968	5	5.2	.5

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waimea (West Kauai) February 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>79% (n=11)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>14% (n=2)</b>	<b>93%</b> <b>(n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	

79%  
(n=11)

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	12	0%
Out of Home	4	12	33%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	12	0%
Complaints	0	12	0%
CSP Timelines	6	6	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
1	100%	0	0	1	90%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,397	268	210	5	11.2	2.4

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Hana February-March 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=13

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>62% (n=8)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>23% (n=3)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>15% (n=2)</b>

**62%  
(n=8)**

**85%  
(n=11)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	6	0%
Out of Home	4	6	67%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	6	0%
Complaints	1	6	17%
CSP Timelines	6	6	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
1	1	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	72%	0	0	0	100%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	313	10	78	0	3.2	0

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waiakea February-March 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>100% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>100% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	27	0%
Out of Home	8	27	30%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	27	0%
Complaints	0	27	0%
CSP Timelines	20	27	74%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	3	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	96%	1	0	0	92.7%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	3,336	253	406	3	7.6	.7

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Waianae February-March 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=22

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>86% (n=19)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>5% (n=1)</b>	<b>91%</b> <b>(n=20)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>9% (n=2)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**95%**  
**(n=21)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	44	0%
Out of Home	6	44	14%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	44	0%
Complaints	0	44	0%
CSP Timelines	24	44	55%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
3	2	67%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	100%	2	0	0	96.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	5,516	606	1000	9	11.0	.9

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## McKinley March 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=14

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance  <b>93% (n=13)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>93% (n=13)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance  <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance  <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=14)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	13	0%
Out of Home	2	13	15%
Service Delivery Gaps	1	13	8%
Complaints	0	13	0%
CSP Timelines	13	13	100%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
4	4	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	76%	1	0	1	97.3%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	4,597	145	442	6	3.2	1.4

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education

## Kailua March 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=15

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>93% (n=14)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>93% (n=14)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>7% (n=1)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	

**100%  
(n=15)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	26	0%
Out of Home	6	26	23%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	26	0%
Complaints	0	26	0%
CSP Timelines	16	25	64%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
6	6	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
0	75%	2	0	2	91.4%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	2,626	320	510	37	12.2	7.3

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education



## Maui High March 2005

### Internal Review Results

n=19

<b>Test Outcome 1:</b> + Child + System Performance <b>95% (n=18)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 2:</b> - Child + System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>95% (n=18)</b>
<b>Test Outcome 3:</b> + Child - System Performance <b>0% (n=0)</b>	<b>Test Outcome 4:</b> - Child - System Performance <b>5% (n=1)</b>	

**95%  
(n=18)**

### Family Guidance Center

Family Guidance Center	#	# of Clients	Performance
Mainland Placements	0	41	0%
Out of Home	8	41	20%
Service Delivery Gaps	0	41	0%
Complaints	3	41	7%
CSP Timelines	26	41	63%

# Allocated	# Occupied	% Filled
2	2	100%

### School Data

Service Gaps	Timelines	Written Complaints	Telephone Complaints	Hearing Requests	% Qualified Teachers
5	62%	1	0	0	94%

Complex	Regular Education		Special Education		Special Education and Regular Education Suspension Ratio	
	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Enrolled Students	Suspensions	Regular Education Suspension Ratio	Special Education Suspension Ratio
<b>Totals</b>	6,267	261	719	13	4.2	1.8

\* State Average = 88% Regular Education and 12% Special Education